

Remarks

Claims 1-35 are pending in the application. Claims 1-35 currently stand rejected. Claims 1 and 19 are herein amended. Claims 10 and 27 are herein canceled. The Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the following remarks and allowance of claims 1-9, 11-26, and 28-35.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Claims 1-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,959,077 B1 (Calhoun) in view of (“Midwest Region: Primer for Local Number Portability,” Issue 2, p. 1-31, 7/27/1997). (See the Office Action pages 2-5.) Claims 1 and 19 have been amended. Claims 10 and 27 have been canceled. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claims 1 and 19:

Claim 1 has been amended to include all of the limitations of claim 10. Claim 19 has been amended to include all of the limitations of claim 27. Claims 10 and 27 have been canceled. Since claims 1 and 19 are now equivalent to prior claims 10 and 27, claims 1 and 19 will be discussed below with respect to the rejection of claims 10 and 27.

Claim 1 recites, in part, “in response to the occurrence of a predetermined event, programming a local copy of a local number portability database to direct communications for at least one phone number to a second switch, wherein the second switch is located in a different geographic area than the first switch.”

The Office Action stated “Consider claims 10 and 27, Calhoun clearly shows and discloses the method and the communication system, where the second switch is located in a different geographic area than the first switch (Calhoun: abstract, line 19-23).” (See the Office Action at page 4.) The Applicant respectfully traverses this characterization of the prior art.

Calhoun discloses configuring the service control point to instruct the switch to redirect the communication away from the directory number to a different directory number. There is no mention of the geographic location of the service control point or the switches corresponding to the directory numbers. The referenced lines in Calhoun do

not disclose, teach, or suggest that the second switch is located in a different geographic area than the first switch.

Neither Calhoun nor the Midwest Region: Primer for Local Number Portability disclose that the second switch is located in a different geographic area than the first switch and therefore they cannot render claims 1 and 19 unpatentable.

Based on the foregoing comments, the Applicant contends that claim 1 is allowable in view of the cited references, and such indication is respectfully requested. Claim 19 was rejected for similar reasons as claim 1. Claim 19 contains limitations similar to claim 1 and is therefore allowable over the art of record for the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 2-18 depend from independent claim 1, and claims 20-35 depend from independent claim 19, thus incorporating the limitations of their corresponding independent claims. Therefore, the Applicant asserts that claims 2-18 and 20-35 are allowable for at least the reasons given above in support of independent claims 1 and 19, and such indication is respectfully requested.

Claims 11, 12, 28, and 29:

The Office Action stated “Consider claims 11, 12, 28, and 29, Calhoun clearly shows the method and the communication system, where the at least one phone number is a phone number resulting from the translation of a toll free phone number (ten digit directory number); and where the at least one phone number can also be dialed directly (Calhoun: col. 3, line[s] 54-61).” (See the Office Action at page 4.) The Applicant respectfully traverses this characterization of the prior art.

Calhoun discloses an embodiment where “each piece of terminating equipment in an intelligent switched network is assigned a ten-digit directory number.” A ten-digit directory number is specifically defined by Calhoun as “the number which is dialed or input by a caller or source to reach a piece of terminating equipment associated with the dialed directory number.” There is no indication that the ten-digit directory number disclosed by Calhoun is a toll free number. Calhoun does not disclose any method or communication system where the at least one phone number is a phone number resulting from the translation of a toll free phone number. Calhoun does not disclose a toll free

phone number, nor the translation of a toll free phone number into the at least one phone number.

Neither Calhoun nor the Midwest Region: Primer for Local Number Portability disclose a method or communication system where the at least one phone number is a phone number resulting from the translation of a toll free phone number, and where the at least one phone number can also be dialed directly, and therefore they cannot render claims 11, 12, 28, and 29 unpatentable.

Based on the foregoing comments, the Applicant contends that claims 11 and 12 are allowable in view of the cited references, and such indication is respectfully requested. Claims 28 and 29 were rejected for similar reasons as claims 11 and 12. Claims 28 and 29 contain limitations similar to claims 11 and 12, and are therefore allowable over the art of record for the same reasons as claims 11 and 12.

Claims 13, 14, 30, and 31:

The Office Action stated “Consider claims 13, 14, 30, and 31, Calhoun clearly shows the method and the communication system, where the programming the local number portability database is done from a web page (col. 8, claims 6); and where the second switch is changed to terminate calls to the at least one phone number using the web page (Calhoun: col. 8, claim 4).” (See the Office Action at page 4.) The Applicant respectfully traverses this characterization of the prior art.

Calhoun’s claim 6 reads “The system of claim 5, further comprising: a service management system, in communication with the controller, for downloading subscriber information to the database.” There is no teaching or suggestion that this service management system includes a web page. Calhoun does not disclose, teach, or suggest that the database may be programmed from a web page.

Calhoun’s claim 4 reads “The system of claim 3, wherein the database of subscriber information includes one or more alternate directory numbers pursuant to a preselected redirection scheme.” There is no mention of changing a second switch to terminate calls to a phone number using a web page. Calhoun merely discloses some of the contents of the database (alternate directory numbers), not that a web page may be used to change a second switch to terminate calls to a phone number. Providing alternate

directory numbers is not equivalent to changing a switch to terminate calls to a phone number. Further, there is no indication that this operation may be performed via a web page.

Neither Calhoun nor the Midwest Region: Primer for Local Number Portability disclose, teach, or suggest programming the local number portability database from a web page and changing a switch to terminate calls to a phone number using the web page, and therefore cannot render claims 13, 14, 30, and 31 unpatentable.

Based on the foregoing comments, the Applicant contends that claims 13 and 14 are allowable in view of the cited references, and such indication is respectfully requested. Claims 30 and 31 were rejected for similar reasons as claims 13 and 14. Claims 30 and 31 contain limitations similar to claims 13 and 14, and are therefore allowable over the art of record for the same reasons as claims 13 and 14.

Claims 15 and 32:

The Office Action stated “Consider claims 15 and 32, Calhoun clearly shows the method and the communication system, where the change made to the second switch is to activate the termination of pre-programmed numbers from the first switch (Calhoun: col. 7, line[s] 33-41).” (See the Office Action at page 5.) The Applicant respectfully traverses this characterization of the prior art.

The referenced portion of Calhoun simply describes the operation of the emergency re-route service disclosed by Calhoun. There is no mention of changing the second switch to activate the termination of pre-programmed numbers from the first switch. Calhoun described looking up a directory number in a database, and determining if there is an alternate number associated with the directory number in the database. Calhoun does not disclose, teach, or suggest changing a second switch to activate the termination of pre-programmed numbers from the first switch. In fact, Calhoun does not disclose, teach, or suggest the termination of numbers from the first switch.

Neither Calhoun nor the Midwest Region: Primer for Local Number Portability disclose, teach, or suggest a method or communication system where the change made to the second switch is to activate the termination of pre-programmed numbers from the first switch, and therefore cannot render claims 15 and 32 unpatentable.

Based on the foregoing comments, the Applicant contends that claim 15 is allowable in view of the cited references, and such indication is respectfully requested. Claim 32 was rejected for similar reasons as claim 15. Claim 32 contains limitations similar to claim 15, and is therefore allowable over the art of record for the same reasons as claim 15.

Claims 18 and 35:

The Office Action stated “Consider claims 18 and 35, Calhoun clearly shows the method and the communication system, all the phone numbers actively terminated by the first switch are ported to the second switch (Calhoun: col. 7, line[s] 38-43).” (See the Office Action at page 5.) The Applicant respectfully traverses this characterization of the prior art.

The referenced portion of Calhoun simply discloses routing the call to an alternate destination if there is an alternate phone number in the database, and routing the call normally if there is no alternate number in the database. Calhoun does not disclose teach or suggest porting all the phone numbers actively terminated by the first switch to the second switch.

Neither Calhoun nor the Midwest Region: Primer for Local Number Portability disclose, teach, or suggest a method or communication system where all the phone numbers actively terminated by the first switch are ported to the second switch, and therefore cannot render claims 18 and 35 unpatentable.

Based on the foregoing comments, the Applicant contends that claim 18 is allowable in view of the cited references, and such indication is respectfully requested. Claim 35 was rejected for similar reasons as claim 18. Claim 35 contains limitations similar to claim 18, and is therefore allowable over the art of record for the same reasons as claim 18.

Claims 2-9, 16, 17, 20-26, 33, and 34:

Claims 2-9, 16, and 17 depend from independent claim 1, and claims 20-26, 33, and 34 depend from independent claim 19, thus incorporating the limitations of their corresponding independent claims. Therefore, the Applicant asserts that claims 2-9, 16,

17, 20-26, 33, and 34 are allowable for at least the reasons given above in support of independent claims 1 and 19, and such indication is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Based on the above remarks, the Applicant submits that the claims in their present form are allowable. Additional reasons in support of patentability exist, but such reasons are omitted in the interests of clarity and brevity. The Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the claims.

The Applicant believes no fees are due with respect to this filing. However, should the Office determine fees are necessary, the Office is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 210765.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 09/09/2008

/Leslie P. Gehman/

SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Leslie P. Gehman, Reg. No. 45,624

Setter Roche LLP

Telephone: (720) 562-2280

E-mail: les@setterroche.com

Correspondence address:

CUSTOMER NO. 28004

Attn: Steven J. Funk

Sprint

6391 Sprint Parkway

Mailstop: KSOPHT0101-Z2100

Overland Park, KS 66251-2100